THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO

WRIT PETITION No.16003 of 2007

Dated:06.08.2007

Between:

Mohd. Khasim.

…PETITIONER

and

The Special Grade Deputy Collector-cum-Land Reforms Tribunal, Ranga Reddy District, and another.

…RESPONDENTS

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO

WRIT PETITION No.16003 of 2007

ORDER:

The petitioner claims that he is owner of land admeasuring Acs.3.86 guntas (subject land) in survey Nos.90 and 91 situated at Thattiannaram Village, Hayathnagar Mandal, Hyderabad. He applied to second respondent for issue of pattadar pass book/title deed, in vain. Then he approached this Court by filing W.P.No.368 of 2006 seeking a direction to second respondent, which was disposed of on 23.01.2006 directing second respondent to consider the application dated 01.10.2005 filed by the petitioner and pass appropriate orders within six months from the date of receipt of a copy of said order. In obedience thereto second respondent issued a Memo No.B/949/2004 dated 08.11.2006 informing the petitioner that in respect of subject land as per the decree/order in O.S.No.887 of 1987 dated 24.07.1992 and CCC A.No.30 of 1993 dated 15.02.2001, necessary entries are already made duly implementing the judgment of the Civil Court. Aggrieved by the same, instant writ petition is filed.

The matter was initially heard on 30.07.2007. Having noticed that the petitioner has not impleaded third parties who are likely to be affected by a Mandamus that might go from this Court, this Court adjourned the matter giving liberty to the petitioner to implead necessary parties. In spite of granting sufficient time, necessary parties are not impleaded. The learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue submits that against the impugned memo, some

aggrieved persons already filed an appeal before the Revenue Divisional Officer (RDO) concerned under Section 5(5) of the Andhra Pradesh Rights in Land and Pattadar Pass Books Act, 1971(the Act, for brevity). Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this writ petition is dismissed giving liberty to the petitioner to file appeal before RDO concerned against the impugned memo. No costs.

_____

(V.V.S.RAO, J)

06th August, 2007
ghn